



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,945	06/15/2006	Mikael Axelsson	P73932USD	9736
136 7590 05/18/2011 JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC 400 SEVENTH STREET N.W. SUITE 600 WASHINGTON, DC 20004				
EXAMINER TREYGER, ILYA Y				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3761				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/18/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/582,945

Applicant(s)

AXELSSON ET AL.

Examiner

ILYA TREYGER

Art Unit

3761

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 45-72 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-35 are amended.
2. Claims 36-44 are canceled.
3. Claims 45-72 are withdrawn.
4. Claims 1-35 are examined on the merits.

Election/Restrictions

5. Applicant's election with traverse of claims 1-35 in the reply filed on 03/08/2011 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that claims 45-72 define other embodiments of the invention based on the originally presented claims. This is not found persuasive because: Groups I (claims 1-35) and II (45-46) classified in different subclasses are related as combination and subcombination, wherein the combination does not require the particulars of the subcombination; Groups I (claims 1-35) and III (claims 47-71) classified in different subclasses are related as combination and subcombination, wherein the combination does not require the particulars of the subcombination; Groups I (claims 1-35) and IV (claim 72) classified in different subclasses are related as process of making and product made, wherein the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 02/04/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

With respect to claim 1, Applicants argue that the combination of references does not disclose the claimed invention because the clip disclosed by Lee does not perform functions of claimed holding member.

However, since the clip disclosed by Lee is intended for orderly arrangement of flexible lines and defines the disposition of the tube elements within the same plane, it is fully capable of performing claimed functions and is interpreted as being a holding member.

7. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Since Lee expressly discloses a clip for orderly arrangement of flexible lines (Abstract, lines 1-2) that defines the disposition of the tube elements within the same plane (fig. 7), the logic of the obviousness rejection has not been gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure but comes from the reference of Lee.

8. With respect to claim 27, Applicant's arguments are substantially identical to arguments discussed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103


9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 18, 19, 21-26, 27-29, 31, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dadson et al. (US 5,053,003) in view of Lee (US 4,999,885).


11. In Re claim 1, Dadson discloses a device for use in a peritoneal dialysis treatment (Abstract, line 1), wherein the package (Col. 5, line 61) includes:

a line set which comprising a first tubular line element 54 (fig. 1), a second tubular line element 52 (fig. 1), and an element 3 (fig. 1) that is a junction connected between the first and second tubular line elements.



Dadson does not expressly disclose the holding member configured to engage portions of the first and second tubular line elements.

Lee teaches that it is known to use a clip for orderly arrangement of flexible lines that is a holding member connected to both first A and second B tubular elements. Since the clip of Lee defines the disposition of the tube elements within the same plane, and since the tubing of Dadson is formed from the flexible material (col. 4, line 10) the clip is fully capable of being arranged to organize the line set such that the first tubular line element extends in a first curved shape from a first connector at an outer periphery of the first curved shape to the junction; the second tubular line element extends in a second curved shape from a second connector at an outer periphery of the second curved shape to the junction; and wherein the junction is disposed at an inner periphery of the first curved shape and an inner periphery of the second curved shape, such that no part of the line set extends across another part of the line set (See Figs. 7-10).



It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the package of Dadson with an organizing means, as taught by Lee because such modification would provide the organizing of the tubing package for use in a peritoneal dialysis treatment in the safety mode.

12. In Re claim 2, Dadson discloses the claimed invention discussed above, but does not disclose the holding member is arranged to organize the whole line set at substantially the same planar level.

Lee teaches that it is known to make the holding member arranged to organize the whole line set fully capable of being non-sterile at substantially the same planar level (See Figs. 7-10).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the package of Dadson with an organizing means, as taught by Lee because such modification would provide a set being portable.

13. In Re claim 3, Dadson discloses the claimed invention discussed above, but does not disclose the holding member arranged to organize the line set such that no part of the tubular line elements is in contact with another part of the tubular line elements.

Lee teaches that it is known to make the holding member fully capable of being arranged to organize the line set fully capable of being non-sterile such that no part of the first and second tubular line elements is in contact with another part of the first and second tubular line elements (See Figs. 8, 9, and 10).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the package of Dadson with the holding member arranged to organize the line set such that no part of the tubular line elements is in contact with another part of the tubular line elements, as taught by Lee because such modification would prevent tubing from the mechanical damage during the storing the package.

14. In Re claim 4, since the tubing of Dadson is formed from the flexible material (col. 4, line 10), Dadson discloses the line set fully capable of being arranged so as the first curved shape is a first spiral, the second curved shape is a second spiral that is substantially coaxial with the first spira, and the junction is disposed at inner peripheries of the firs and second spirals.

15. In Re claim 6, Dadson discloses the claimed invention discussed above, but does not disclose the holding member configured to hold at least one portion of the first tubular line element in a predetermined position in relation to a portion of the second tubular line element.

Lee teaches using the holding member configured to hold at least one portion of the first tubular line element A in a predetermined position in relation to a portion of the second tubular line element B fully capable of being non-sterile (See Figs. 7 and 8).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the package of Dadson with the holding member, as taught by Lee in order to prevent unpredictable moving of the tubing elements.

16. In Re claim 7, Dadson discloses the claimed invention discussed above, but does not disclose the organizing means comprising the holding member arranged to perform said holding in a detachable manner.

Lee teaches the organizing means comprising the holding member performing the holding in a detachable manner.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the package of Dadson with the organizing means comprising the holder arranged to organize the line set in a detachable manner, as taught by Lee in order to simplify operation the device.

17. In Re claim 8, Dadson discloses the claimed invention discussed above, but does not disclose holding member comprising a first elongated recess, restricted by at least one resilient jaw-shaped member, said resilient jaw-shaped member being provided with at least one concavity for holding detachable said portion of the first tubular line element.

Lee teaches the organizing means comprising the holding member further comprising a first elongated recess (a), restricted by the resilient (Col. 3, ln. 47) jaw-shaped member (b) being provided with the concavity (c) for holding detachable the portion of the tubular member (See Fig. 9) fully capable of being non-sterile.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the package of Dadson with the holding member comprising a

first elongated recess, restricted by the resilient jaw-shaped member being provided with the concavity for holding detachable the portion of the tubular member, as taught by Lee in order to improve the reliability of the holding the tubular element by the holding member.

18. In Re claim 9, Dadson discloses the claimed invention discussed above, as applied to claim 6 above, but does not disclose the organizing means wherein the holding member is configured to hold at least one portion of the first tubular line element and the at least one portion of the second tubular line element, said at least one portion of the first tubular line element and said at least one portion of the second tubular line element being configured in a predetermined position in relation to each other, such that the first and second tubular line elements have a substantially parallel extension in the vicinity of the holding member.

Lee teaches the organizing means wherein the holding member is configured to hold at least one portion of the first tubular line element A and a portion of the second tubular line element B, said one portion of the first tubular line element and said one portion of the second tubular line element being configured in a predetermined position in relation to each other, such that the first and second tubular line elements fully capable of being non-sterile have a substantially parallel extension in the vicinity of the holding member (See Fig. 7).

All the elements of the claimed invention are known in the art. One skilled in the art could have combined the known elements by known means, yielding the predictable result of holding member configured to hold at least one portion of the first tubular line element and the at least one portion of the second tubular line element, said at least one portion of the first tubular line element and said at least one portion of the second tubular line element being configured in a predetermined position in relation to each other, such that the

first and second tubular line elements have a substantially parallel extension in the vicinity of the holding member. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the holding member of Lee to the device of Dadson in order to provide device with the type of holding member that is known to be suitable for holding tubular elements in a predetermined position substantially parallel to each other.

19. In Re claim 10, Dadson discloses the claimed invention discussed above, as applied to claim 7, but does not disclose the holding member is configured to be connected to a second connector, said second connector being mounted to an end of the second tubular line element.

Lee teaches the holding member being is fully capable to be connected to a connector being mounted to an end of the second tubular line element fully capable of being non-sterile, since the organizing means can comprise the unlimited quantity of clips (holding members) comprising the concavity (c) for holding detachable the portion of the tubular member (See Figs. 7-10).

All the elements of the claimed invention are known in the art. One skilled in the art could have combined the known elements by known means, yielding the predictable result of holding member configured to hold fixedly a connector being mounted to an end of the tubular line element. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the holding member of Lee to the device of Dadson in order to provide device with the type of holding member that is known to be suitable for holding fixedly a connector being mounted to an end of the tubular line element.

20. In Re claim 11, Dadson discloses the claimed invention discussed above, but does not disclose the organizing means wherein the holding member comprises a hole extending through the holding member for receiving said connector.

Lee teaches the organizing means wherein the holding member comprises a pocket 4, which is a variation of the hole, and fully capable of receiving the connector mounted to the end of the tubular line element (See Figs. 8-10).

All the elements of the claimed invention are known in the art. One skilled in the art could have combined the known elements by known means, yielding the predictable result of the holding member comprising the hole for receiving the connector mounted to the end of the tubular line element. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the holding member of Lee to the device of Dadson in order to provide the device with the type of holding member that is known to be suitable for holding the connector mounted to the end of the butulare line element.

21. In Re claim 12, Dadson discloses the line set comprising a drain bag, and the line set, fully capable of being non-sterile, is connected to the drain bag (See Col. 6, ln. 14).

22. In Re claim 18, Dadson discloses the package wherein the package comprises a drain bag and the line set, fully capable of being non-sterile, is connected to the drain bag via connector 68 positioned at an outer periphery of the line set (See Col. 6, ln. 7-9; Fig. 1).

23. In Re claim 19, Dadson discloses the package wherein the package comprises a solution bag and the line set, fully capable of being non-sterile, is connected to the solution bag (Col. 6, ln. 60, 61; Col. 7, ln. 16-18).

24. In Re claim 21, Dadson discloses the package wherein the line set is connected to the solution bag via connector 64 positioned at an outer periphery of the line set (See Col. 6, ln. 7-9; Fig. 1).

25. In Re claim 22, Dadson discloses the package wherein the solution bag is filled with a dialysate solution (Col. 6, ln. 60, 61).

26. In Re claim 23, Dadson discloses the package wherein the line set, fully capable of being non-sterile, comprises a third connector 60 connectable to a patient connector (See Col. 6, ln. 3-5; Fig. 1).

27. In Re claim 24, Dadson discloses the package wherein the third connector 60 is configured in a space at an inner periphery of the line set (See Fig. 1) fully capable of being non-sterile.

28. In Re claim 25, Dadson discloses the package wherein the line set comprises a component in the form of at least one flow organizer 65, 68 (Fig. 1) fully capable of being arranged to provide a space sufficient for the flow organizer such that the flow organizer does not load on any part of the first and second tubular line elements.

29. In Re claim 26, Dadson discloses the package wherein the package comprises a wrapping for encasing the line set (Col. 5, ln.61, 62) since in accordance with the definition the package is “a wrapped or boxed object” (See The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition), what reads on comprises a wrapping.

30. In Re claim 27, Dadson discloses a method for manufacturing of a package for use in a peritoneal dialysis treatment (Abstract, line 1), wherein the package (Col. 5, line 61) includes a drain bag (col. 3, line 5), a line set which comprises a first tubular line element 54 fully capable

of being non-sterile, a second tubular line element 52, an element 3 (fig. 1) that is a junction connected between the first and second tubular line elements, and a third tubular element 50 (fig. 1) connected between the junction and a patient connector, wherein the package is configured to substantially eliminate the risk of damage to the package or line set during sterilization, since the line set has been disclosed as supplied in sterile condition in a single PD package (Col. 5, lines 64, 65).

Dadson does not expressly disclose the organizing means connected to both first and second tubular elements and arranged to organize the line set such that no part of the line set extends across another part of the line set.

Lee teaches that it is known to use a clip for orderly arrangement of flexible lines that is a holding member fully capable of being connected to both first A and second B tubular elements. Since the clip of Lee defines the disposition of the tube elements within the same plane (See Figs. 7-10), the step of organizing the line set such that no part of the line set extends across another part of the line set and fully capable of being arranged to organize the line set such that no part of the line set extends across another part of the line set is disclosed (See Figs. 7-10).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Dadson with the step of positioning of the line set and fixing of the holding member are configured to substantially eliminate damage to the package or line set by retaining the patient connector at an inner periphery of the line set and preventing any part of the line set from extending across another part of the line set, as taught by Lee because such modification would provide the organizing of the tubing package for use in a peritoneal dialysis treatment in the safety mode.

31. In Re claim 28, Dadson discloses the claimed invention discussed above, but does not disclose the method characterized by the step of organizing the whole line set, at substantially the same level.

Lee teaches that it is known to use the organizing means capable to organize the whole line set, fully capable of being non-sterile, at substantially the same level (See Figs. 8, 9, and 10).

Since the organizing means is fully capable of organizing the whole line set at substantially the same level has been disclosed as provided, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Dadson with the step of organizing the whole line set at substantially the same level, as taught by Lee because such modification would provide a set being portable.

32. In Re claim 29, Dadson discloses the claimed invention discussed above, but does not expressly disclose the method characterized by the step of organizing the line set such that no part of the tubular line elements is in contact with another part of the tubular line elements.

Lee teaches that it is known to use the organizing means capable to organize the line set, fully capable of being non-sterile, such that no part of the tubular line elements, fully capable of being non-sterile, is in contact with another part of the tubular line elements (See Figs. 8, 9, and 10), fully capable of being non-sterile.

Since the organizing means capable to organize the line set such that no part of the tubular line elements is in contact with another part of the tubular line elements, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Dadson with the step of organizing the line set such that no part of the

tubular line elements is in contact with another part of the tubular line elements, as taught by Lee because such modification would prevent tubing from the mechanical damage during the storing the package.

33. In Re claim 31, Dadson discloses the claimed invention discussed above, but does not expressly disclose the method including the step of organizing the line set by means of a holding member being configured to hold at least one portion of the first tubular line element in a predetermined position, in relation to a portion of the second tubular line element.

Lee teaches the organizing means comprising the holding member configured to hold at least one portion of the first tubular line element A, fully capable of being non-sterile, in a predetermined position in relation to a portion of the second tubular line element B (See Figs. 7 and 8), fully capable of being non-sterile.

Since the organizing means capable to hold one portion of the tubular line element in a predetermined position in relation to another tubular line element, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Dadson with the step of organizing the line set by means of a holding member being configured to hold at least one portion of the first tubular line element in a predetermined position, in relation to a portion of the second tubular line element, as taught by Lee in order to prevent unpredictable moving of the tubing elements.


34. In Re claim 34, Dadson discloses the package wherein the package comprises a wrapping for encasing the line set (Col. 5, ln.61, 62), since in accordance with the definition the package is “a wrapped or boxed object” (See The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition), what reads on comprises a wrapping.

Since the package comprising the wrapping disclosed as provided, it means the step of providing the package with a wrapping has been disclosed.

35. Claims 5, 13, 15-17, 20, 30, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dadson et al. (US 5,053,003) in view of Lee (US 4,999,885) and further in view of Keilman (US 5,820,582).

36. In Re claim 5, Dadson in view of Lee disclose the claimed invention, as applied to claim 1 above, but do not expressly disclose the package for use in a peritoneal dialysis treatment, wherein at least one tubular lane element is pre-shaped to extend along a desired path.

Keilman teaches the system used for a peritoneal dialysis procedure (See Abstract, ln. 4, 5), wherein tubular lane elements, fully capable of being non-sterile, are pre-shaped to extend along a desired path (See Fig. 1).



All the elements of the claimed invention are known in the art. One skilled in the art could have combined the known elements by known means, yielding the

predictable result of tubing packaged in the pre-shaped form. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the tubing packaged in the pre-shaped form of Keilman to the device of Dadson/ Lee in order to provide device with the tubing packaged in the pre-shaped form.

37. In Re claim 13, Dadson in view of Lee disclose the claimed invention, as applied to claim 1 above, but do not expressly disclose the package for use in a peritoneal dialysis treatment, wherein the first and second tubular line elements, are manufactured of PVC.

Keilman teaches the system used for a peritoneal dialysis procedure (See Abstract, ln. 4, 5), wherein tubular line elements, fully capable of being non-sterile, are manufactured of PVC (See Col. 6, ln. 30-32).

All the elements of the claimed invention are known in the art. One skilled in the art could have combined the known elements by known means, yielding the predictable result of tubing for dialysis procedure made of PVC. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the PVC tubing of Keilman to the device of Dadson/ Lee in order to provide device with the tubing made of material that is known to be suitable for tubing set used for dialysis procedure.

38. In Re claim 15, Dadson in view of Lee disclose the claimed invention, as applied to claim 12 above, but do not expressly disclose the package for use in a peritoneal dialysis treatment, wherein the drain bag is foldable to form first and second folded parts and wherein the line set configured in the package between the first and second folded parts of the drain bag.

Keilman teaches the drain bag constructed of flexible plastic material (Col. 2, ln. 19, 20) and, consequently, fully capable of being folded in the claimed manner.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the package of Dadson/ Lee with the flexible bag foldable to form first and second folded parts and wherein the line set configured in the package between the first and second folded parts of the drain bag, as taught by Keilman in order to make the package portable.

39. In Re claims 16 and 17, Dadson in view of Lee and further in view of Keilman disclose the claimed invention, , but do not expressly disclose the package for use in a peritoneal dialysis treatment, wherein the holding member is arranged to detachably engage one of said first and second folded parts of the drain bag, and wherein the holding member comprises a second recess restricted by at least one resilient jaw-shaped member, said jaw-shaped member is provided with at least one protruding member for engaging detachably the edge area.

Lee teaches the holding member comprising the recess (d) restricted by the resilient jaw-shaped member (b), and protruding member (e) (See Fig. 10).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the package of Dadson/ Lee / Keilman with the holding member, as taught by Keilman, since Keilman discloses substantially the same structure, as that claimed by applicant, the structure is fully capable of performing the claimed function of the holding member being arranged to detachably engage the folded part of the drain bag.

40. In Re claim 20, Dadson in view of Lee disclose the claimed invention, as applied to claim 12 above, but do not expressly disclose the package for use in a peritoneal dialysis treatment, wherein the drain bag is applied on the solution bag.

Keilman teaches the system, wherein the drain bag is applied on the solution bag (See Col. 2, ln. 3, 10-13; Fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the package of Dadson/ Lee with the drain bag is applied on the solution bag, as taught by Keilman in order to form the package is such a manner to substantially reduce packaging size requirements and to simplify the packaging procedure.

41. In Re claim 30, Dadson in view of Lee disclose the claimed invention, as applied to claim 27 above, but do not expressly disclose the method for use in a peritoneal dialysis treatment, including the step of organizing the line set in a spiral shaped state.

Keilman teaches the line set, fully capable of being non-sterile, provided in a spiral shaped state (See Fig. 1).

Since the line set organized in a spiral shaped state has been disclosed as provided, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Dadson/ Lee with the step of organizing the line set in a spiral shaped state, as taught by Keilman because such modification would provide the compact packaging of the line set.

42. In Re claim 32, Dadson in view of Lee disclose the claimed invention, as applied to claim 27 above, but do not expressly disclose the method, the steps of folding the drain bag to form

first and second folded parts and wherein the line set configured in the package between the first and second folded parts of the drain bag.

Keilman teaches the drain bag constructed of flexible plastic material (Col. 2, ln. 19, 20) and, consequently, fully capable of being folded in the claimed manner.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the method of Dadson/ Lee with the steps of folding the drain bag to form first and second folded parts and wherein the line set configured in the package between the first and second folded parts of the drain bag, as taught by Keilman in order to make the package portable.

43. In Re claim 33, Dadson in view of Lee disclose the claimed invention, but do not expressly disclose the method including the step of applying the drain bag on the solution bag.

Keilman teaches the system, wherein the drain bag is applied on the solution bag (See Col. 2, ln. 3, 10-13; Fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the method of Dadson/ Lee with the step of applying the drain bag on the solution bag, as taught by Keilman in order to form the package in such a manner to substantially reduce packaging size requirements and to simplify the packaging procedure.

44. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dadson et al. (US 5,053,003) in view of Lee (US 4,999,885), as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Maasola (US 4,772,497).

Dadson in view of Lee disclose the claimed invention discussed above, but do not expressly disclose the package for use in a peritoneal dialysis treatment, wherein the drain bag is manufactured of a plastic material having higher resistance against heat than PVC.

Maasola teaches the bag for medical solutions made of a mixture of polyolefin and an elastomer (See Abstract, ln. 9-12). Since the bag material of Maasola is substantially identical to the bag material of claim 14 by its chemical composition (See Specification, page 4, [0034], ln. 27-30), the resistance against heat is inherent, as per *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the package of Dadson/ Lee with the drain bag manufactured of a plastic material having higher resistance against heat than PVC, as taught by Lee in order to make the bag compatible with the steam sterilization process.

45. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dadson et al. (US 5,053,003) in view of Lee (US 4,999,885), as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Shang et al. (US 2002/0115795).

Dadson in view of Lee disclose the claimed invention discussed above, but do not expressly disclose the method including the step of exposing the package for autoclave sterilization.

Shang teaches the step of placing (exposing) the tube set in a steam autoclave.

All the elements of the claimed invention are known in the art. One skilled in the art could have combined the known elements by known means, yielding the predictable result of the autoclave sterilization process. It would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the method of Dadson/ Lee with the step of placing (exposing) the tube set in a steam autoclave, of Shang in order to provide the method with the sterilization process known in the art.

Conclusion

46. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ILYA TREYGER whose telephone number is (571)270-3217. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tatyana Zalukaeva can be reached on 571-272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3761

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ilya Y Treyger/
Examiner, Art Unit 3761

/Michele M Kidwell/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3761